2001 0717 IGSL v.4

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 10 2001

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION NO. 68502

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS CONCERNING IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR THE GREENLINE/URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY FOR THE CITY OF SAN JOSE, FOR WHICH AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAS BEEN PREPARED.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN JOSE:

WHEREAS, the Council intends to approve text mendments to the *San Jose 2020 General Plan*; changes to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram of the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* to depict the extent of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, and a new chapter for the City of San Jose's Municipal Code to establish a process for amendments to the proposed Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary; and

WHEREAS, prior to the adoption of the Resolution, the Planning Commission of the City of San Jose has certified that the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary ("Project") was completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and state and local guidelines and the City Council has upheld an appeal of that decision finding the EIR certification by the Planning Commission was complete in accordance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the Project requires the City to approve text mendments to the *San Jose 2020 General Plan*; changes to the Land Use/Transportation Diagram of the *San Jose 2020 General Plan* to depict the extent of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, and a new chapter for the City of San Jose's Municipal Code to establish a process for amendments to the proposed Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of San Jose is the decision-making body for General Plan Amendments and revisions to the Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, CEQA requires that in connection with the approval of a project for which an EIR has been prepared which identifies one or more significant environmental effects, the decision-making agency must make certain findings regarding those effects;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL does hereby find that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the FEIR and other information in the record and has considered the information contained therein including the written and oral comments received at the public hearings on the FEIR and on the Project, prior to acting upon or approving the Project, and has found that the FEIR represents the

independent judgment of the City of San Jose as Lead Agency for the Project, and designates the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement at his office at 801 North First Street, Room 400, San Jose, California 95110, as the custodian of documents and records of proceedings on which this decision is based; and

THAT THE CITY COUNCIL does hereby make the following findings with respect to the significant effects on the environment of the Project, as identified in the FEIR:

I. LAND USE

A. Land Use Compatibility

1. **Impact:** Adoption of a Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause new land use impacts, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid such impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will result in cumulatively significant land use compatibility impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not result in significant land use compatibility impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulative land use compatibility impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

B. Loss of Agricultural Land and Open Space

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause the loss of open space and/or agricultural land. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in a cumulatively significant loss of agricultural land and open space.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause the loss of open space and/or agricultural land, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. There is no mitigation that will reduce the cumulative impact from implementation of the adopted General Plan to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** The cumulative loss of open space and agricultural land resulting from implementation of the General Plan with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

II. VISUAL AND AESTHETIC QUALITY

A. Visual

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not result in any significant adverse impact on the visual quality of the San Jose area, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid visual impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant changes in the visual environment.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause visual impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. There is no mitigation that will reduce the cumulative impact from implementation of the adopted General Plan to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** The cumulative impact to visual quality resulting from implementation of the General Plan with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

A. Geologic, Soils and Seismic

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant adverse impacts resulting from geologic, soils or seismic conditions, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant impacts as a result of development occurring in areas subject to geologic and seismic impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause soils, geologic or seismic impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulative soils, geologic and seismic impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant soils, geologic and seismic impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

IV. DRAINAGE, FLOODING AND WATER QUALITY

A. Drainage, Flooding and Water Quality

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant adverse flooding, drainage or waters quality impacts, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant flooding, drainage and water quality impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause flooding, drainage and water quality impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulative flooding, drainage and water quality impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant flooding, drainage and water quality impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

A. Prehistoric and Historic Resources

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant impacts to historic or prehistoric resources, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant impacts to historic and prehistoric resources.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause impacts to historic or prehistoric resources, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulatively significant impacts to historic and prehistoric resources to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant impacts to historic and prehistoric resources resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

VI. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A. Hazardous Materials

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant hazardous materials impacts, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant hazardous materials impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause hazardous materials impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulatively significant hazardous materials impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant hazardous materials impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR, and with appropriate laws and regulations.

VII. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

A. Special Status Species

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant impacts to special status species, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant impacts to special status species.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause impacts to special status species, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulatively significant special status species impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant impacts to special status species resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR, and with appropriate laws and regulations.

B. **Ordinance Size Trees**

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant impacts to ordinance size trees, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause impacts to ordinance size trees, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with the City's tree removal ordinance will prevent significant cumulative impacts to ordinance size trees.

3. **Finding:** The FEIR does not identify significant unmitigated impacts to ordinance size trees as resulting from either the project or cumulative development.

VI. TRANSPORTATION

A. **Transportation**

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause any significant impacts to the transportation system, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts or reduce the ability of the City to mitigate or avoid those impacts. Implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant increases in traffic congestion.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause transportation impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce the cumulatively significant traffic congestion to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant traffic impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

VII. AIR QUALITY

A. 1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause estimated population to exceed projections in the Clear Air Plan, nor will it cause VMT to increase faster than population in the City of San Jose Sphere of Influence. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will have cumulatively significant regional and local air quality impacts.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant air quality impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant local and regional air quality impacts, but not to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** The cumulative impacts to local and regional air quality resulting from implementation of the General Plan with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

VIII. NOISE

A. Traffic Noise

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant increases in noise as a result of increased traffic on existing and planned roadways, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts, or reduce the ability of the City to reduce or avoid such impacts. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result cumulatively significant increases in noise along certain roadway segments within the City of San Jose.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant traffic noise impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant traffic noise impacts, but not to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** The cumulative increase in traffic-related noise resulting from implementation of the General Plan with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary therefore remains significant and unavoidable.

B. Light Rail Noise

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant increases in noise as a result of construction of proposed light rail lines, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts, or reduce the ability of the City to reduce or avoid such impacts. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result cumulatively significant increases in noise as a result of construction of proposed light rail lines.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant light rail noise impacts, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified

in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant light rail noise impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant light rail noise impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

C. **Sensitive Land Uses**

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant increases in noise impacts to residences or other sensitive receptors, nor will it exacerbate the severity of such impacts, or reduce the ability of the City to reduce or avoid such impacts. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result cumulatively significant increases in noise exposure for sensitive receptors.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant noise impacts to residential and other sensitive receptors, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant noise impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant noise impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

IX. ENERGY

A. **Energy**

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant increases in energy uses. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant increases in energy uses.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause increases in energy use, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant energy impacts to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant energy impacts resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

X. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

A. Utilities and Service Systems

1. **Impact:** Adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause significant increases in demand for utilities and services capacity, as described in the Final EIR. Implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will result in cumulatively significant increases in demand for utilities and services capacity.

2. **Mitigation:** Since adoption of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary will not cause increases in demand for utility capacity, no mitigation is necessary for project impacts. Conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR will reduce cumulatively significant impacts from increased demand for utility and service capacity to a less than significant level.

3. **Finding:** Cumulatively significant increased utility and service capacity demands resulting from implementation of the adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, will be reduced to a less than significant level by conformance with General Plan goals and policies identified in the Final EIR.

XI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. **NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE:** Under a "No Project/No Development" alternative, no further urban development would occur in the City's Sphere of Influence.

1. **Comparison to Project:** This alternative would completely avoid all of the identified cumulatively significant unavoidable impacts anticipated to occur as a result of implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary.

2. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected for the following reasons:

a. The No Project/No Development Alternative would fail to satisfy any of the City's General Plan Goals and would be inconsistent with virtually all of the General Plan Major Strategies, particularly the Economic Development, Downtown Revitalization, and Housing Strategies;

b. This Alternative would fail to satisfy the following objectives of the Project, as set forth in the EIR:

i. Promote fiscally and environmentally sustainable development, particularly "infill" development, in locations where the City can most efficiently provide urban services;

ii. Establish greater consistency between City and County land use plans and development policies.

c. Based on the foregoing, the City finds that the No Project /No Development Alternative is not feasible.

B. **NO PROJECT/NO CHANGE IN THE GENERAL PLAN ALTERNATIVE**: Under this alternative, the proposed Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would not be approved but the existing adopted General Plan would still be implemented.

1. **Comparison to Project:** This alternative would have all of the identified cumulatively significant unavoidable impacts anticipated to occur as a result of implementation of the City's adopted General Plan, with or without the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary.

2. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected for the following reasons:

a. The No Project/No Change in the General Plan Alternative would fail to satisfy any of the following objectives of the Project, as set forth in the EIR:

i. More clearly differentiate, over the long-term, between those lands planned and reserved for urban purposes and those which are intended to remain rural in character. Lands within the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would receive urban services and lands outside the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would not.

ii. Create assurances that the growth management policies are seriously and thoroughly evaluated before any change in these policies is entertained.

iii. Provide a greater degree of certainty for residents and property owners regarding the long-term expectations for urban development.

iv. Promote fiscally and environmentally sustainable development, particularly "infill" development, in locations where the City can most efficiently provide urban services.

v. Preserve surrounding hillsides, wetlands and agricultural and other open space lands as a legacy for future residents and maintain the City's reputation as an attractive place to live and work.

vi. Establish greater consistency between City and County land use plans and development policies.

b. Because the proposed project would not have any significant environmental impacts, this alternative is not environmentally superior to the project as it is proposed.

C. SMALLER AREA INSIDE THE URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY (ALTERNATIVE LOCATION)

1. **Description of Alternative:** This alternative would make the area inside the UGB smaller than is proposed; this is an alternative location for the urban growth limit line. Two possible locations for revising the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary B inward would be to exclude those portions of the Silver Creek Planned Residential Community and the Edenvale Redevelopment Area presently designated as non-urban hillside, and to exclude the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve.

2. **Comparison to Project:** The environmental impacts from implementation of the City and County General Plans with the non-urban hillside areas outside the UGB would be the same as those impacts anticipated from implementation of the General Plans with the UGB in the location proposed. The environmental impacts which might result from an alternative that places the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve outside the UGB, and removes the Urban Reserve designation, would be less than implementation of the General Plans with the Urban Reserve inside the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary and designated for eventual urbanization. This alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

3. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected for the following reasons:

   a. The existing General Plan designates the Coyote Valley Urban Reserve as a resource for the future, when the City may need additional housing. If the Urban Reserve designation is removed, the City's ability to access this additional site for housing would be limited in the future. The Coyote Valley Urban Reserve is one of several mechanisms available to the City to increase housing capacity. Retention of these mechanisms will ensure sufficient housing capacity to meet the City's needs. This alternative would, therefore, be less compatible than the project with existing General Plan goals and policies, particularly Housing Goals 2, 3, 4 and 6.

   b. This Alternative would fail to satisfy the following objectives of the Project, as set forth in the EIR:

      i. More clearly differentiate, over the long-term, between those lands planned and reserved for urban purposes and those which are intended to remain rural in character. Lands within the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would receive urban services and lands outside the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would not; and

      ii. Preserve options for the optimal use of lands reserved for future growth, *i.e.*, the Urban Reserves.

D. LARGER AREA INSIDE THE GREENLINE/URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY (ALTERNATIVE LOCATION)

1. **Description of Alternative:** This alternative would make the area inside the UGB larger than is proposed; this is also an alternative location for the urban growth limit line. One possible location for revising the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary outward would be to include within the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary those portions of the properties known as the Richmond and Young Ranches.

2. **Comparison to Project:** Placing the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary so as to include portions of the Richmond and Young Ranches inside the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary would not reduce any of the cumulatively significant environmental impacts likely to result from implementation of the General Plan with the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary as proposed, and could, if ultimate development is assumed, eventually result in a number of additional significant adverse impacts. This alternative would not be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

3. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected for the following reasons:

   a. This alternative is not compatible with the following project objectives:
      i. Provide a greater degree of certainty for residents and property owners regarding the long-term expectations for urban development.
      ii. Promote fiscally and environmentally sustainable development, particularly "infill" development, in locations where the City can most efficiently provide urban services.
      iii. Preserve surrounding hillsides, wetlands and agricultural and other open space lands as a legacy for future residents and maintain the City's reputation as an attractive place to live and work.
      iv. Protect public health and safety by preventing urban development in areas subject to natural hazards.
      v. Establish greater consistency between City and County land use plans and development policies for areas within and outside the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary.

   b. Because the ultimate development allowed under this alternative could have significant environmental impacts, this alternative is not environmentally superior to the project as it is proposed.

E. NO MINOR MODIFICATIONS OF THE GREENLINE/URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY

1. **Description of Alternative:** This alternative would revise the language of the proposed General Plan text amendments to allow **no** modifications to the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary location outside of a comprehensive General Plan update, even areas of less than five acres located below the 15% slope line.

2. **Comparison to Project:** This alternative would result in a reduced likelihood of environmental impacts occurring as a result of the small amount of development that could occur with these minor modifications.

3. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected because it is considered overly restrictive to limit minor changes to the Urban Growth Boundary to a major General Plan update. It would allow no flexibility or discretion on the part of the City to modify the boundary even for development below the 15% slope line, which is not the intent of the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary policy.

F. EASEMENTS IN THE GREENBELT

1. **Description of Alternative:** In this alternative, the City or another Agency would seek open space easements for those properties that make up the Greenbelt on the edge of the urban envelope.

2. **Comparison to Project:** Dedication of open space easements in the Greenbelt would be as effective as the proposed project in protecting the Greenbelt from development, and would have no more environmental impacts. To the extent that such easements would preclude all development and the impacts of such development while the existing land use designations, even with the Greenline/Urban Growth Boundary, allow some limited development, this alternative may be environmentally superior.

3. **Findings:** This alternative is hereby rejected because there is at this time no financial mechanism available to the City of San Jose that would allow the implementation of this alternative.

ADOPTED and issued this 20th day of October, 1998, by the following vote:

AYES: DANDO, FERNANDES, JOHNSON, PANDORI, POWERS, SHIRAKAWA, WOODY; HAMMER

NOES: DIAZ, DIQUISTO, FISCALINI

ABSENT: NONE

Susan Hammer

SUSAN HAMMER, Mayor

ATTEST:

Nancy Alford

PATRICIA L. O'HEARN,
City Clerk
BY: NANCY ALFORD, ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C124925199